



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/712,835	11/13/2003	Ramajeyam Gopalraj	LOT920030016US1	9518
23550	7590	07/31/2008	EXAMINER	
HOFFMAN WARNICK LLC			KUMAR, ANIL N	
75 STATE STREET			ART UNIT	
14TH FLOOR			PAPER NUMBER	
ALBANY, NY 12207			2174	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/31/2008	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

PTOCommunications@hwdpatents.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/712,835	<b>Applicant(s)</b> GOPALRAJ, RAMAJEYAM	
	<b>Examiner</b> ANIL N. KUMAR	<b>Art Unit</b> 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 April 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This action is in response to the RCE filed on April 28th, 2008. Claims 1-20 are pending and have been considered below.

#### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claim 1 objected to because of the following informalities: “obtaining a request for information from an active window in the web application that requires authentication for retrieval of the information, all windows in the web application being arranged in a tree-type hierarchical structure”. The second clause seems to be disjointed from the first part of the limitation, and some sort a conjunction to connect the two clauses or a separate limitation might help to clarify the claim limitation. Appropriate correction is required.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

3. Claim1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Examiner could not determine what the amended part of second limitation “automatically locating, based on the request, an ancestor window...” is meant to point out and distinctly claim. If locating the ancestor window is “automatic”, then there seems to be no need for an explicit user request. The examiner will assume the user request to be valid, and ignore the “automatic” part during this prosecution. Furthermore, Examiner could not determine what the last part of second limitation “...

adaptable to become of the sufficient size to display an entirety of a login page” is meant to point out and distinctly claim. Is “sufficient size” referring to, the size required to display ALL the contents of the login page regardless of font size or legibility, or to the maximum display screen size but use scrolling mechanisms if necessary to make the page legible?. The examiner will assume the claim language to give more weight to legibility of the screen in order to make the login page functional during this prosecution.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Tock et al. (US 7146403 B2) in view of Gelsinger et al. (US 5892511) and in further view of Southgate (5,561,757).

Claim s 1, 6, 12 and 17: Tock et al. discloses a method of processing a request in a web application, the method comprising;

- obtaining a request that requires authentication (i.e. ... then the request processing 300 attempts to authenticate 304 the requestor ... column 8 lines 23-37 and Fig. 3);
- obtaining a request for information from an active window in the web application (The secure access can be provided through a public network –browsing without authentication- using a standard network browser, column 2 lines 11-23) that requires authentication for retrieval of the information (i.e. ... then the request processing 300 attempts to authenticate 304 the requestor ... column 8 lines 23-37 and Fig. 3);
- and displaying the login page in the ancestor window (i.e. ... a login page can be returned 308 to the requestor... column 8 lines 23-37 and Fig. 3);

but does not disclose

- all windows in the web application being arranged in a tree-type hierarchical structure;
- automatically locating, based on the request, an ancestor window for the active window of the web application by traversing a hierarchy from the active window to the ancestor window, the ancestor window being at least one of a sufficient size or adaptable to become of the sufficient size to display an entirety of a login page.

However, Gelsinger et al. disclose that hierarchical tree-type structure for windows is notoriously well known in the art ( As is known to those skilled in the art, operating systems such as Windows.TM. 95 support both parent and child

windows –tree-type structure-, column 5 lines 1-15) and further disclose locating, based on the request, an ancestor window for an active window of the web application by traversing a hierarchy from the active window to the ancestor window (a user is allowed – based on a request - to automatically cycle through sets – or hierarchy of each set - of one or more windows which do not overlap by more than a predetermined amount until all current top-level/ancestry windows have been displayed, column 2 lines 54-62), and further disclose determining the window size and location (i.e..... window selection agent 230 may determine the size and position of each of the current top-level windows ... column 5 lines 44-52 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for locating and determining the size and location of a specific window like an ancestor or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to locate a specific window, when there could be potentially multiple windows open, and the size of those windows are different.

But, Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. are silent as to determining the size of the window to be sufficient for displaying an entirety of information. However, Southgate discloses a method to determine the size of the window so that the displayed information will be functional/entirety to the user (i.e. ... determine the smallest size for the dimension that the window can have and still be functional or be useful to the user... column 7 lines 51-61). Since Tock et al. disclose “displaying login page”, and Gelsinger et al. disclose “determining the ancestor /

top-level window”, therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Southgate., determine the smallest size that the window can have so that the display (e.g., data, graphics) will be recognizable by the user, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to determine the size of the window, if the information displayed needs some minimum size to be useful for the user.

Claim 2: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose, comprising generating the request in the active window (column 4 lines 23-26), wherein every window in the web application includes a parent attribute that is used for the traversing of the hierarchy, the parent attribute indicating whether the window has a parent, and, if so, identifying the parent window (operating systems such as Windows support both parent and child windows, inherent that there must be a means to link parent and child windows, column 5 lines 1-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to anticipate, as taught by Gelsinger et al., user requests from any windows, like active windows, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to anticipate requests from any type of window, as the server may have no control on the requests that it receives.

Claim 3: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for manipulating windows like closing an active window (column 5 lines 23-33). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide this feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., like closing an active window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide various window manipulation features that are demanded by web-based applications.

Claims 4: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Tock et al. disclose, wherein active window comprises a modal window (i.e. ... the requestor is forced to login ... cols 8/9 lines 50-3). Note one of the ways to force the user is making the window "modal".

Claims 5: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 1 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose, wherein ancestor window comprises a top-level window (i.e. ... the selection agent obtains a list of the current top-level windows, step 905...



cols 10/11 lines 52-7 –and- ... the window's parent is compared with one or more predetermined groups, and if the parent is part of the one or more groups, then that window is included in the set in step 910... cols 10/11 lines 55-7 and Fig. 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for determining the ancestor window is top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to make sure that the ancestor/parent window of the active window is a top-level window if the size of the current window is important.

Claim 7: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for receiving information (login) and authenticating that information (Fig. 3).

Claim 8: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 7 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for fulfilling requests if authentication were successful (Fig. 3).

Claim 9: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific

window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for determining if the request has been timed out before fulfilling the requests (Fig. 3).

Claim 10: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (column 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for locating and displaying in a specific window, like ancestor or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide methods for locating and displaying in a specific mode of display, like ancestor or top-level windows, depending on the applications need such as a requirement to get feed back on a specific page before proceeding to next page.

Claim 11: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 6 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (column 5

lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (column 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for locating, closing or opening a window and displaying in a specific window, like ancestor or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a basic window features like locating, opening or closing windows in addition to specific mode of display, like display in ancestor or top-level windows, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement to display in a specific window and close the window from which the request came from.

Claim 13: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 12 above. Furthermore, Tock et al. disclose a system that returns a valid page to user (Fig. 3). Also, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (column 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for locating and displaying in specific windows, like hierarchal windows, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like hierarchal windows, depending on the

applications need such as a requirement to get feed back on a specific page before proceeding to next page.

Claim 14: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 13 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (column 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for displaying the in new window, like top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like a new top-level window, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement that the user need to keep the initial page open, when trying to access a secure page.

Claim 15: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 13 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (column 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it

would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for displaying the ancestor window of a current (child) window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a specific mode of display, like an ancestor window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement that the user need to be in the ancestor window, when trying to access a secure page.

Claim 16: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 12 above. Furthermore, Tock et al disclose methods for receiving information (login) and authenticating that information (Fig. 3).

Claim 18: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 17 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window identification, like the type of active window (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for determining a specific window, like child window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide specific features for

window identifications, like type of active window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement for not allowing some operations in a parent window.

Claim 19: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 18 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window identification, like the type of active window (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for determining a specific window, like ancestor window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide specific features for window identifications, like type of active window, depending on the applications need such as a requirement for not allowing some operations in a child window.

Claim 20: Tock et al. and Gelsinger et al. and Southgate disclose a system to process web requests, authenticate and return appropriate page in a specific window type like ancestor window, as in claim 18 above. Furthermore, Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for assisting window locating and selection (column 5 lines 20-33 and Fig 2) and displaying using standard computer operating system and a window selection agent (column 5 lines 53-65 and Fig. 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to provide the feature, as taught by Gelsinger et al., for locating, closing or opening a window and displaying in a specific window, like ancestor or top-level window, in Tock et al. One would be motivated to provide a basic window features like locating, opening or closing windows in addition to specific mode of display, like display in ancestor or top-level windows, depending on the applications need, such as a requirement to display in a specific window and close the window from which the request came from.

### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on April 28th, 2008 have been fully considered but they were found not persuasive.

A. Applicant argues, "For example, with respect to independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 17, Applicant submits that the cited references fail to teach or suggest automatically locating an ancestor window for an active window of the web application that is at least one of a sufficient size or adaptable to become of the sufficient size to display an entirety of a login page". The Examiner respectfully disagrees, and maintains the rejection, and further point out it is moot in view of new rejection.

- B. Applicant argues, “the minimum size of Southgate is taught as being the minimum size required for functionality and not as a size required for displaying an entirety of a page”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. *Functionality*: The actions (operations), capabilities and usefulness of something such as a software application (*Computer Encyclopedia*). Hence displaying a page, which is still remains functional, will have to display all its information to remain functional.
- C. Applicant argues, “Furthermore, Gelsinger does not reference login or authentication activities at all”. The Examiner agrees, but maintains the rejection and refers the applicant to the “login page” rejection that is based on Tock et al. and not Gelsinger et al.
- D. Applicant argues, “Gelsinger does not indicate that there is any change in the information on the activated window, merely that it becomes the new active window as is”. The Examiner points out that “the change in information on the activated window” was not found in the claim language.
- E. Applicant argues, “Gelsinger does not teach traversing a hierarchy, but rather, performing a comparison”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Gelsinger et al. disclose methods for traversing a set or hierarchy of windows (a user is allowed – based on a request - to cycle through sets – or hierarchy of each set -



of one or more windows which do not overlap by more than a predetermined amount until all current top-level/ancestry windows have been displayed, column 2 lines 54-62),

F. Applicant argues, “Gelsinger, as well as the other references, is silent with regard to the presence of a parent attribute in each window in the web application”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Identifying the parent window with child window is not required by the web allocation as most of the well know OS do provide this feature that can be utilized by the applications via APIs as suggested by Gelsinger et al. (operating systems such as Windows support both parent and child windows, inherent that there must be a means to link parent and child windows, column 5 lines 1-15).

G. Applicant argues, “even assuming, arguendo, that the Office is correct in the use of modal windows to force users to login, there are many other methods to force users to login, and, as such, the use of a modal windows is not necessitated or suggested by this statement, as modal windows may not be advisable for login purposes in some instances”. The Examiner respectfully disagrees. Tock et al. teach, a method that forces user to stay in the same window, albeit same returned window, until they can successfully login, which is same as saying login/active window is a modal window.

H. Applicant argues, "Applicant respectfully submits that there is no motivation within the references themselves or elsewhere in the art for modifying the references". In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, all the three cited prior art are generally in the same domain, managing user interaction in a GUI environment, and each of them addressing some aspect of window management, with the primary reference focused on user authentication in a GUI environment.

### **Conclusion**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anil N. Kumar whose telephone number is (571) 270-1693. The examiner can normally be reached on Wednesdays and alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri EST (Alternate Mon-Tue and Thu-Fri off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

ANK

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art  
Unit 2178

7/11/2008

Application/Control Number: 10/712,835  
Art Unit: 2178

Page 19